

## REMARKS


This Amendment is being submitted for the above-identified application in response to the Office Action dated 1/26/05. In the Office Action, the Examiner requested election of Species 1 (Figure 3) or Species 2 (Figure 6) and election of Sub Species A (Figure 4, claim 7) or Sub Species B (Figure 5, claim 8). Applicants hereby elect without traverse Species 1 (Figure 3) and elect with traverse Sub Species B (Figure 5). Claims 2-10 read on Species 1 and are elected and claim 8 reads on Sub Species B and is elected with traverse.

Applicants have amended claim 8 to be dependent on claim 7. Support for the amendment can be found in the specification, for example, on page 7, paragraph 34 and page 9, paragraph 46. As such, Applicants submit that Sub Species A (claim 7) and Sub Species B (claim 8) are not patentably distinct sub species requiring restriction. The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the restriction requirement regarding claims 7 and 8.

Respectfully submitted,

STATTLER, JOHANSEN & ADELI LLP

Dated: 7/25/05



Gregory Suh  
Reg. No. 48,187

Stattler Johansen & Adeli LLP  
PO Box 51860  
Palo Alto, CA 94303-0728  
Phone: (650) 752-0990 ext.104  
Fax: (650) 752-0995